

Maya Contreras

From: carolyn griglione [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2012 7:50 PM
To: Maya Contreras
Cc: Jeffrey Farner; Zunilda Rodriguez; Laura Durham
Subject: Re: Beauregard Rezoning Advisory Group - Meeting Schedules

8.12.12

Dear Maya,

I have visited all eight sites. My husband accompanied me. Good to hear his totally removed take on each site. He has absolutely no interest in what is chosen. An unbiased opinion is always good.

A few questions.

1. Why was the area for most of the sites given in sq. ft. but one as .85 acres and #6 had no designation?
2. Why was the cost for each parcel not given? That would be a major determining factor as to whether it could be considered.
3. Depending on the cost of the parcels could two of them be considered?
4. I do want to mention that my husband could not get beyond asking what was the intended use for each site. He could not make a determination without knowing what the use was to be. I have the same concern. It seems like buying a house from its outside appearance without checking to see if it has plumbing. Each site has merit depending what is planned for the site. Are we using one standard? A playground? Just a stand of trees? A place for a picnic? A nature preserve? How can we determine which site is best until we determine how the site is to be used? Is it to be used?
5. If a site is determined to be perfect for a playground will the purchase of the playground equipment be part of the 1.5M or just the purchase of the land?
6. For those sites that have numerous trees will the arborist evaluate the health of the trees prior to a decision being made? Maybe many of the trees are diseased and would need to be removed which would be a cost. Think VDOT removing 59 trees at a cost of \$60,000 in McLean.
7. I am having a hard time seeing the validity of my rankings when I don't know how the site is to be used. The topography might be great for leaving the parcel as a stand of trees but pitiful for a playground.

Thanks for any light you can shed on my questions.

Do I turn in my ranking sheets to someone? Will these be discussed at the Aug. 22 meeting?

Carolyn

[REDACTED]

Zunilda Rodriguez

From: Maya Contreras
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2012 2:24 PM
To: Shirley Downs
Cc: Jeffrey Farner
Subject: RE: materials for tonight

Hi Shirley -

Thank you for your email. We will make copies of it for the AG. Did you have other items that you wanted to include? I'm not sure what you are referencing in your first sentence where you mention pointing out elements.

Maya

From: Shirley Downs [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2012 2:15 PM
To: Maya Contreras; Jeffrey Farner
Subject: materials for tonight

Hi,

Could you send these to all of the members of the Advisory Group and could we arrange to have them projected up on the wall so we can point out elements.

Also could people from the community present information about each of the sites and explain what surrounds them and the thinking that went into each nomination before any votes are taken to eliminate any site?

I care deeply about the Polk site and have an obligation to our Civic Association to articulate why we want it to be considered I also think other sites also have merit and would like to be able to comment on them. I think other people from the community feel the same way. Can there be a way that each of us can comment as each site is discussed in turn?

The members of the AG were so great on the tour if we could continue that kind of free, open, and flexible interaction that would be great. It would also be very helpful to walk the balance of the sites together because as you saw the last time it really matters.

I know there are many who are interested in the Town Center site and community members commented at length during the Stakeholder Group deliberations and then in their comments to the City about what they wanted in that center square in terms of resources and amenities. I think there should be a discussion about that even if that site is not chosen in terms of the purchase of land or some other investment. I have always believed that it should anchor the Beauregard development and that the City should work with the developers to be able to provide additional city amenities there. That is what has made Shirlington so successful. It is not just the bus stops and grocery store it is also the movie theatre, restaurants, library, and theaters. Without plans to be able to include some "place maker" elements like that at some time I don't think the Beauregard development project is going to succeed in the way city planners and community members envisioned it should.

We do not need just parks, transit, a better grocery store, and bike trails. How are we going to help make the commercial spaces successful and inviting. How can we insure that they serve a place maker and resource functions.

What funding is there available from the city for art? What can we do to build in transitions to allow the community to grow organically. How can we make a poison pill so that the federal government never takes land from us again, decimating our tax base and exempting themselves from any local, input rule or regulation. If the City chooses one space for this \$1.5 million can this group recommend how we might incorporate some of the community recommendations that are not adopted so that they can be incorporated at a later date. These kinds of issues need to be discussed as we consider the space purchase issues. We are not just looking and weighing things in terms of buildings and land. It is people who make a community, that is why we need to ask, and listen to what current residents want and need now and what they will want in the future. And how we can intelligently stage this. Hopefully this will not be the last time Alexandria thinks about the unmet needs and inherent value and quality of the community and residents that are already here.

Thank you,

Shirley Downs

